



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,604	01/16/2001	David Edward Caldwell	CO2-2	5820

20808 7590 12/19/2002

BROWN & MICHAELS, PC
400 M & T BANK BUILDING
118 NORTH TIOGA ST
ITHACA, NY 14850

EXAMINER

KINDRED, ALFORD W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/761,604

Applicant(s)

CALDWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Alford W. Kindred

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Application filed on 01/16/01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaya et al., US# 2002/0161664 A1, in view of Herz, US# 6,029,195.

As per claims 1-3, Shaya et al. teaches "developing a set of features that apply to the products in the class" (see col. 3, lines 1-45) "a scoring function for each feature . . . rank different product . . ." (see col. 10, lines 40-65 and col.12, lines 5-30) "developing text snippets for each feature . . ." (see col. 3, lines 12-48 and fig. 16—sheet 8 of 12) "user profiles, the profiles being collections of . . . user profile . . ." (see col. 9, lines 20-50). Shaya et al. does not explicitly teach "grouping of these features, which serve . . . thematically . . .". Herz teaches "grouping of these features, which serve . . . thematically . . ." (see col. 71, lines 50-67). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Shaya and Herz because using the steps of "grouping of these features, which serve . . . thematically . . ." would have given those skilled in the art the tools to display data in

Art Unit: 2172

an image form. This gives users the advantage of attaching an image to data, for easy viewing, in a computer environment.

As per claims 4-5, Shaya et al. teaches "testing the user profiles" (see abstract).

As per claim 6, Shaya et al. teaches "providing access to the product comparison . . ." (see col. 11, lines 30-67).

As per claim 7, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

--Shaya et al. teaches "a computer network . . ." (see fig. 3—sheet 2 of 12).

As per claims 8-12, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to arguments given above for rejected claims 1-7 and are similarly rejected including the following:

--Shaya et al. teaches "display and explanation of a comparison between several products" (see figs. 8A, 8B, 9A—sheet 5 of 12).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US# 6,311,194 B1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 703-305-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday, 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Alford W. Kindred
Patent Examiner
Tech Ctr. 2100
December 2, 2002